REMARKS

Claims 1 to 38 are pending. Claims 39 to 64 are canceled. Claim 1 is currently amended.

Claim 1 is amended for clarification of the subject matter referred to by the word "thereof". It is submitted that the amendment does not narrow the scope of the claim. Support for the amendment to claim 1 may be found, for example, in previously presented claim 1 and in the specification on page 9, lines 17-21.

Response To Advisory Action

The Patent Office did not enter Applicants' previously filed Amendment and Response under § 1.116, and bearing a certificate of mailing date of May 20, 2005, on the grounds that additional searching would be necessary.

Applicants submit that the present amendment resolves outstanding § 102 issues, and that evidence of surprising results presented herein is intended to advance prosecution by addressing any corresponding § 103 issues that might be raised upon withdrawal of the § 102 rejection.

§ 102 Rejections

Claims 1-38 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Coggio et al. (US 6,080,487) for the reasons set forth in paragraphs 6-7 of the Office Action dated 12-2-2004 and in view of the following.

The Patent Office asserts that as discussed in the earlier office action for § 102 rejection over Coggio et al., the Coggio et al. reference has disclosed a method of dehydrofluorination of a fluoropolymer film surface by surface treatment of the fluoropolymer film with solutions of various "basic compounds" with the presence of a "phase transfer catalyst".

The Patent Office further asserts that since the basic compound useful as modifying agent can specifically be either carbonate or hydroxide from potassium or sodium, such basic compound is actually an anionic conjugate acid in term of acid-conjugate base relationship. For instance, potassium carbonate is an anionic conjugate of the carbonic acid. The Patent Office argues that such a basic solution is therefore reading on the claimed modifying composition comprising a solvent as liquid vehicle, a phase, transfer catalyst, and at least one of a sulfide, or polysulfide salt or anionic conjugate acid thereof. The Patent Office asserts that only one being selected from (A) sulfide, (B) polysulfide salt and (C) anionic conjugate acid is required according to the limitation. The Patent Office further asserts that Coggio et al. has disclosed the claimed structure for fluoropolymer having a backbone comprising subunits having the structure of $-CH_2CFX-$. It is also noted that heating temperature is around 40-100 °C for complete dehydrofluorination. The Patent Office then argues that therefore Coggio et al. anticipates the limitations of Claim 1.

In response, Applicants submit that the clarifying amendment to claim 1 overcomes the rejection. Claims 2 - 38 each add additional features to patentable claim 1, and are likewise patentable.

Hence, the rejection of claims 1-38 under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by Coggio et al. has been overcome and should be withdrawn.

In view of the above, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the application is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

June 21, 2005
Date

By: Bradford Wright
Bradford B. Wright, Reg. No.: 34,459
Telephone No.: (651) 736-4172

Office of Intellectual Property Counsel
3M Innovative Properties Company
Facsimile No.: 651-736-3833

PAGE 12/12 * RCVD AT 6/21/2005 4:56:04 PM [Eastern Daylight Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-1/0 * DNIS:8729306 * CSID:651 736 6133 * DURATION (mm-ss):03-32